

- (4) place the specific name *caeneus* Buckman, 1925, as published in the binomen *Caenisites caeneus* on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*;
- (5) place the generic name *Euasteroceras* Donovan, 1953 (type species, by original designation, *Ammonites turneri* J. de C. Sowerby, 1824) (gender of generic name: neuter) on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*.

## References

- Arkell, W. J., and Donovan, D. T., 1954: *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6: 364.  
 Buckman, S. S., 1898: *Quart. Journ. geol. Soc. Lond.* 54: 442-62.  
 — 1918: *ibidem*, 73: 257-327, pls. xxvi-xxxi.  
 — 1925, *Type Ammonites*, 5, Part LII. London.  
 Donovan, D. T., 1953: *Proc. geol. Soc. Lond.*, No. 1503: xiii-xiv.  
 Oppel, A., 1856 (-58): *Die Juraformation*. Stuttgart.  
 Reynès, P., 1879: *Monographie des Ammonites*. Paris and Marseille.  
 Sowerby, J., 1818: *Mineral Conchology* 2: 203, pl. 190.  
 Sowerby, J. de C., 1824: *Mineral Conchology* 5: 75, pl. 452.  
 Spath, L. F., 1923: *Quart. Journ. geol. Soc. Lond.* 79: 66-90.  
 — 1946: *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (11) 12: 490-496.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE  
 GENERIC NAME "CAENISITES" BUCKMAN (S. S.), 1925 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA,  
 ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

By R. V. MELVILLE, M.Sc.  
 (Geological Survey and Museum, London)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)798)

(Communication received 3rd August 1954)

I have no claim to a specialist knowledge of ammonite-systematics, but from a general acquaintance with the group of ammonites in question, I feel that Dr. Spath's objections to the proposal that *Caenisites* be suppressed, carry more weight than the arguments put forward by Dr. Arkell and Dr. Donovan. I find it difficult to understand how these specialists can, in view of their reputation for scientific objectivity, question whether *Caenisites caeneus* belongs to the *turneri* group of ammonite species. The close relationship between *C. caeneus* and this group seems to me as obvious as any point of a taxonomic nature in fossils can be. The malformation of the holotype does not obscure the features which betray this relationship and upon which the generic assignation is based. At the most it might make specific determination difficult in the case of a specimen showing no overlap with the normal portion of the holotype; though even this difficulty is diminished if Dr. Spath's view (that *C. caeneus* is a malformed variant of *Ammonites plottii* Reynès) is accepted.

I can see no danger to stability and uniformity of nomenclatorial usage in the perpetuation of the generic name *Caenisites*. An analogous case occurs in a group with which I am familiar. The echinoid genus *Hagenowia* Duncan, 1889 (*Journ. Linn. Soc.—Zool.* 23 : 210) has as type species (by monotypy) *Cardiaster rostratus* Forbes, 1852 (*Mem. geol. Surv.*, Decade IV : 1-4, pl. x, figs. 19-24). The holotype of this species is malformed in that the anterior rostrum which is the outstanding generic feature has been shortened by injury during life and has healed without regaining its original length. No difficulty has ever arisen in the interpretation of the genus or of the species, either taxonomically or nomenclatorially as a result of this malformation. The case of *Caenisites* seems to me closely similar and I support Dr. Spath's application for the official recognition of the name.

**SUPPORT FOR DR. ARKELL'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO "CAENISITES"  
BUCKMAN (S. S.), 1925 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)**

By HELMUT HOLDER

(Institut und Museum für Geologie und Paläontologie  
der Universität Tübingen, Germany)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.)798)

(Letter dated 30th September 1954)

Ich schliesse mich dem von W. J. Arkell und D. T. Donovan eingereichten Vorschlag zur Unterdrückung des Gattungs-Namens *Caenisites* Buckman, 1925 an. Denn der Genotypus der Gattung ist auf ein monströses Exemplar (Specie-Typus von *Caenisites caeneus* Buckman) gegründet, das nicht eindeutig bestimmt werden kann. Dieser Sachverhalt widerspricht daher der beabsichtigten Kontinuität der zoologischen Nomenklatur.

**SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF  
THE GENERIC NAME "CAENISITES" BUCKMAN (S. S.), 1925 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)**

By P. C. SYLVESTER-BRADLEY

(University of Sheffield, Sheffield, England)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)798)

(Communication received 30th September 1954)

I wish to support the recommendation of Arkell and Donovan (1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 364-365) that the Commission should suppress the name *Caenisites* Buckman, 1925. This name was never used since the date of its proposal until its resurrection in 1946, and has not even since then passed into general usage. No confusion can therefore follow its suppression.

The name *Euasteroceras* Donovan, 1953, which by some is considered a subjective synonym of *Caenisites*, is typified by a well-known species characteristic of a group of importance to both Jurassic stratigraphy and palaeontology. Previously these species had been known by the now inadmissible name *Arietites*. Specialists disagree as to the synonymy of *Euasteroceras* and *Caenisites* and agreement can never be reached since the type species of *Caenisites* is known by only the holotype, which all agree to be a monstrosity. The existence of the two names is, therefore, a danger to both stability and universal usage, for stratigraphers who are not ammonite specialists are at a loss which name to use. The suppression of the name *Caenisites* is, therefore, in full accord with the general directive given at Copenhagen for the use of the Commission's Plenary Powers (*Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 23).